

adults; the bill, however, is much smaller. The tail has the general indistinctness of marking peculiar to immature examples of *Coccyzus*; the wing feathers are narrowly edged and tipped with rusty; the throat and chest are plain ashy; the lower sides, flanks and under tail coverts are strongly washed with dull tawny-ochraceous. In one rather interesting point this specimen is peculiar—the outer pair of rectrices fall 18 mm. short of the other feathers, giving the tail a more fan-shaped and therefore more normal appearance than in the adult, which has a square tail.

It would have been, perhaps, hardly worth while to make this correction here had not Sclater, on Barrows' record alone, included *Coccyzus punilus* in his Argentine Ornithology (Vol. II, p. 39), remarking that "the species was only previously known to occur in Venezuela and Colombia." In the Catalogue of Birds in the British Museum, Vol. XIX, 1891, p. 313, Shelley includes in his synonymy, under *Coccyzus punilus*, a reference to Barrows' record, but does not allow that record to affect the distribution of the species, the habitat of which is given as "The Island of Trinidad,\* Venezuela and Columbia."—*Outram Bangs*.

#### ON A SUPPOSED CONTINENTAL SPECIMEN OF SOLENODON.

There is in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy a specimen of *Solenodon* that was sent in alcohol (entire and apparently fresh when immersed in the spirits) from the Isthmus of Darien, in 1871, by the late Dr. G. A. Maack. Twenty years later, on the strength of this specimen, Prof. Samuel Garman in his review of Flower and Lydekker's "An Introduction to the Study of Mammals Living and Extinct" † said: "We find *Solenodon* restricted to Cuba and Hayti though also found in Central America." This published statement brought forth for a time no end of comment, and Professor Garman defended himself by saying that there was the specimen and that there could be no question of its genuineness. In time the controversy died a natural death, and even Garman's statement that *Solenodon* occurs in Central America is probably now forgotten. Fearing, however, that one day the question was sure to be mooted again, I took the *Solenodon* out of its jar, skinned it, removed the skull and compared it with all available material. This I did with the utmost care, because if *Solenodon* does still occur on the continent—as does not seem altogether unreasonable in the light of recent discoveries ‡—it surely must be different from either of the island species with which we are familiar.

The specimen in question proved indistinguishable in any way from Cuban examples, but, wishing another opinion than my own, I sent it to Gerrit S. Miller, Jr., who agreed with me that it unquestionably belonged

\* Neither Léotaud nor Chapman give this bird as found in Trinidad, and I therefore doubt its occurrence there. See Chapman, Bull. Am. Mus. of Nat. Hist., Vol. VI, 1894, pp. 10-11, as to numerous birds wrongly attributed to the island.

† *The Nation*, No. 1381, Dec. 17, 1891, p. 477.

‡ The discovery of a Capromys-like rodent in the mountains of Venezuela—*Procapromys geaji* (Pousargues)—is not less astonishing, and much in the same line, as would be the existence of a *Solenodon* on the continent.

to the Cuban species—*Solenodon cubanus* Peters. In only one way is it at all peculiar—its fore-claws are very long and sharp and obviously had not been used in digging or scratching for insects for some time before its death, at once suggesting its having been kept in confinement.

The whole matter, therefore, of the continental record of *Solenodon* may be disposed of for good in a few words. The specimen (No. 3223, Mus. Comp. Zool.) is a perfectly characteristic example of the Cuban *Solenodon*; it was sent without comment or special data from the Isthmus of Darien by a reliable naturalist, but it has certain appearances of having been kept in confinement, and in all probability was brought alive from Cuba to Darien, where Dr. Maack secured it either still living or soon after its death.—*Outram Bangs*.

### ON THE HABITS OF CAMBARUS UHLERI FAXON.

*Cambarus uhleri*, described by Faxon from a rather extensive series of specimens sent him by Dr. Philip Uhler, is apparently confined to the portion of Maryland known popularly as the Eastern Shore. According to Dr. Uhler and his collector, his specimens were found in ditches, even in places where the water was decidedly brackish.

Two years ago in Somerset County, and last summer in Dorchester County, I found the species rather abundant in burrows in low-lying areas not far from the bay but always near ponds or ditches of fresh water. In nearly every case the area selected was in dense pine woods.

The burrows were quite similar to those made by *C. diogenes*, and, like that species, *C. uhleri* erects a chimney over the mouth of its burrow. The chimney is usually rather low and can not represent any considerable portion of the earth removed from the hole, for in some cases this extended to a depth of 4 or 5 feet. A single individual invariably occupied a burrow and no communication between burrows was observed. In a lot of about a dozen specimens collected near Crisfield, in September, 1903, both forms of the male are represented; it would therefore appear that the time of ecdysis and transition from form II to form I must be in the late fall. From inquiries I learned that in the spring the animals emerge from their burrows and are common in ditches and small streams. This emergence, like that of *C. diogenes*, is doubtless for the purpose of mating, which having been accomplished, the crayfish returns to a burrow or digs a new one. The color of all the specimens observed was a dirty greenish brown, the tips of the chelæ alone being somewhat reddish. Dr. Uhler, in conversation, has reported that some of his specimens were beautifully marked with spots of golden yellow. Throughout the region mentioned the crayfish is known as the "lobster."

*C. uhleri* is unquestionably an offshoot from the *C. diogenes* stock and has probably reached its rather isolated range from the north. The examination of an extensive series of specimens from localities lying farther to the northward, but still on the Maryland-Virginia Peninsula, would be of great interest and would doubtless throw some light on the post-glacial distribution of our crayfishes.—*W. P. Hay*.